

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3, 9, and 11 have been amended, and claims 4-5 and 12-13 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-17 remain pending in the application.

Amendments and New Claims

Support for the amendments can be found on page 14, line 21, through page 15, line 13 of the present application, as well as in Figures 3a-3b and in previous claims 5 and 13.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1, 3-8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,763,095 to *Cermak et al.* (hereinafter “Cermak”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128036 to *Yach et al.* (hereinafter “Yach”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections of claims 4 and 5 are obviated by their cancellations.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method comprising:

“receiving, by a wireless mobile communication device, a first user request from an input key of the wireless mobile communication device;

in response, displaying, by the wireless mobile communication device, on a display of the wireless mobile communication device, a list of communication messages to and from a communication partner of at least two message types selected from a message type group comprising of an email message type, a text message type, a voice message type, and a call message type, the displaying including displaying representations of the communication messages of the list;

receiving, by the wireless mobile communication device, a second user request from the same or another input key of the wireless mobile communication device selecting a representation of one of the communication messages of the list; and

in response to said receiving the second request,

displaying, by the wireless mobile communication device, a list of selectable entries associated with multiple communication protocols to facilitate the user in selecting a communication protocol, and

facilitating, by the wireless mobile communication device, reply to the communication message in the selected communication protocol.”

Thus, when properly viewed as a whole, claim 1 teaches providing a user with with an end user interface comprising a message listing of messages of multiple types, to and from a communication partner, the end user interface facilitating a user in selecting a message, and in response, displaying a list of selectable entries associated with multiple communication protocols to facilitate the user in selecting a communication protocol for replying to the selected message.

In contrast, Cermak does not teach or suggest “displaying a list of selectable entries associated with multiple communication protocols to facilitate the user in selecting a communication protocol” in response to selection of a displayed message for replying, as is claimed in amended claim 1. Rather, Cermak simply teaches a system for identifying callers/senders to a called/messaged party to facilitate the party in determining whether to answer/respond. In one variation, Cermak discloses displaying the messages, such as call messages, IM messages, voicemail messages, and email messages, in a unified messaging mailbox on a television or a workstation. Cermak further discloses that a user may read a message of one type in the mailbox, such as an email, and may then decide to call the email sender (i.e., reply in a different communication protocol). Cermak also teaches facility to reply to message over an existing connection (44) between the receiver and sender (col. 7, lines 44-47).

Thus, while Cermak admittedly teaches replying to a message in a different communication protocol than that of the message, Cermak does not teach any sort of display of entries associated with communication protocols to facilitate a user in selecting a communication protocol. Further, by disclosing a mechanism for replying to a message/call sender using a current, existing connection 44, Cermak teaches away from providing a mechanism to select a protocol for reply. One skilled in the art would not think to modify Cermak to include a display facilitating the selection of a communication protocol for reply because an existing connection associated with a communication protocol is already in use by the sender and receiver.

Further, Yach does not cure this deficiency. Yach simply teaches that a unified messaging mailbox may include messages to and from a receiver, the messages having different types. Yach does not discuss displaying entries associated with multiple protocols to facilitate a user in selecting a protocol for reply. Thus, Yach does not teach or suggest amended claim 1.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under 35 USC §103(a).

Claims 3 and 6-8 depend from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 3 and 6-8 are patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

2. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 4 on page 5 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 9 and 11-17 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973 to *Smith et al.* (hereinafter “Smith”), and further in view of Yach under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections of claims 12-13 are obviated by their cancellations.

Amended claim 9 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 9 is patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Smith does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak and Yach, and is simply cited by the Examiner as disclosing a list particularized to a single communication partner. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Smith, alone or in combination, under 35 USC §103(a).

Claims 11 and 14-17 depend from claim 9, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 11 and 14-17 are patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

3. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 5 on page 9 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 2 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of Yach, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0177471 to *Kaaresoja et al.* (hereinafter “Kaaresoja”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Kaaresoja does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak and Yach. Accordingly, claim 1 remains patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

4. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 6 on page 10 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 10 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of Smith in view of Yach, and further in view of Kaaresoja under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Kaaresoja does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak, Smith, and Yach. Accordingly, claims 9 remains patentable over Cermak, Smith, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over Cermak, Smith, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 6-11, and 14-17 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicants submit that claims 1-2, 6-11, and 14-17 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: July 27, 2007

by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981